

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

PATENT

In re the Application of:
Kurt ROBSON et al.
Serial No.: 09/867,333
Filed: May 29, 2001
For: **METHODS AND SYSTEMS FOR
MANAGING HIERARCHICALLY
ORGANIZED AND INTERDEPENDENT
TASKS AND ISSUES**
Atty. Docket No.: ORCL5727

) Examiner: Scott L. JARRETT
)
) Group Art Unit: 3623
)
) Confirmation No.: 6000
)
) Customer No.: 53156
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
**COMMENTS ON REASONS FOR
ALLOWANCE**
)
)

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In response to the Notice of Allowability and Fee(s) Due mailed June 8, 2007, Applicants submit the following comments regarding the Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance contained therein.

Reasons for allowance are only warranted in instances in which "the record of the prosecution as a whole does not make clear the Examiner's reasons for allowing a claim or claims." 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(e).

In the present case, Applicants believe the record as a whole makes clear the reasons for allowance and therefore no statement by the Examiner is necessary, warranted – or allowed by the implementing rules (C.F.R.) to which the USPTO is bound. Furthermore, the statement may unfairly focus attention on specific language of the independent claims where no such focus is

warranted. Therefore, the record should reflect that Applicants do not necessarily agree with the Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance.

Applicants' claims should be limited only by the terms utilized therein. In this application, the Examiner loosely quotes portions of the allowed claims in the statement of reasons for allowance. Therefore, the statement is inaccurate to the extent that the language varies from the language that is recited in the respective claims. Moreover, the Examiner further characterizes the applied references at length. Such characterizations are unnecessary, and do not afford the applicant the opportunity to redress any perceived discrepancies between the Examiner's characterization and the actual text thereof. Therefore, Applicants do not necessarily agree with the Examiner's characterizations of the applied references and respectfully submits that the prosecution history of the present application constitutes a sufficient record of the respective positions of the Office and of the applicant. Thus, Applicants hereby submit these Comments in an effort to ensure that the allowed claims are properly construed based only upon limitations that are expressly present therein and/or to ensure that the claims are not interpreted so as to include any additional claim limitations that are not found in the respective claims or any limitations that may be inferred from the Examiner's characterizations of the applied references after *inter partes* examination has concluded.

Should there remain unresolved issues that require action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned so that any such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: June 12, 2007

By: _____

Alan W. Young
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 37,970

YOUNG LAW FIRM, P.C.
4370 Alpine Rd., Ste. 106
Portola Valley, CA 94028
Tel.: (650) 851-7210
Fax: (650) 851-7232